



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,177	02/24/2004	Ha-Yeong Yang	1594.1335	9278

21171 7590 05/23/2006

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

ALI, MOHAMMAD M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3744

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/784,177

Applicant(s)

YANG, HA-YEONG

Examiner

Mohammad M. Ali

Art Unit

3744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 11-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 11-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6, 11, 13-14, 16-19, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watenable (JP 2003-79519 A) in view of Sharpe (US20040016348A1). Watenable discloses a cooking apparatus 13 comprising a casing forming an enclosure of the cooking apparatus 13; and a temperature adjusting unit/cooking plate 11 mounted on the casing, with an upper portion thereof protruding from an upper surface on the casing on which food is placed, wherein the temperature adjusting unit exchanging heat with the food to heat or cool the food, a peltier element 13, a heat sink with heat emitting pins 16, a ventilation fan 17, a temperature sensor 18 a temperature setter 19 and a controller 20, the peltier element 13 also comprising with reversible endoergic 15 and exothermic 15 sides. Watenable discloses the invention

Art Unit: 3744

substantially as claimed as stated above. See 1. However, Watenable does not disclose allocation of a temperature sensor at the food or the food container. Sharpe teaches the use of a temperature sensor 11/11a located at food 2o or food container 12 coupled to a microprocessor 16 in cooking pan system for the purpose of sense the temperature of the food or the food container. See Fig. 1, Para [0035], [0036], the lines 5-7 of Para [0035] disclose "Electronic module 16 display 18 to show a user of pan system 10 characteristics associated with pan 12 or food (e.g., in the form of an egg) 20 within pan 12." This clearly indicates that pan 12 is a food preparation pan on which food 20 is placed Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cooking apparatus of Watenable in view of Sharpe such that a temperature sensor could be provided in order to sense the temperature of the food or the food container.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3744

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanable in view of Sharpe and further in view of Michel (FR 2604882 A1). Watanable in view of Sharpe discloses the invention substantially as claimed as stated above. However, Watanable in view of does not disclose induction/AC heating. Michel teaches combined heating system of induction heating and thermoelectric or Peltier heating/cooling device in a cooking apparatus for the purpose of cooking and temperature control of food items. See Fig.1 and the translated abstract. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cooking apparatus of Watanable in view of Sharpe and further in view of Michel such that an induction heating system could be combined with the Peltier cooking system of Watanable in order to provide dual heating system.

Claims 12, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanable in view of Sharpe as applied to claim 1 and 16 above and further in view of Chauchy (US 6,282,906). Watanable in view of Sharpe discloses the invention substantially as claimed as stated above. However, Watanable in view of Sharpe does not disclose DC power supply. Cauchy teaches the use of DC power supply in a peltier

or thermoelectric food heating cooling system-heating system of for the purpose of cooking and temperature control of food items. See Fig.4, and column 4, lines 34-35. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cooking apparatus of Watanable in view of Sharpe and further in view of Cauchy such that DC power could be provided in order to operate the Peltier/thermoelectric food temperature control apparatus.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/08/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues, "Sharpe discloses an electronic cooking pan system 10 with temperature sensors 11/11a embedded inside a thermally conductive pan 12 to monitor the temperature of the pan 12 Figures 1 and 2). It is apparent from the disclosure of Sharpe that the temperature sensors 11/11a do not contact any food being cooked in the pan 12. Rather, the sensors 11/11a are embedded inside the structure of the pan 12, as is apparent in Figure 2. This is also supported by several sections in the disclosure of Sharpe. S'A temperature sensor 11 may be calibrated to correspond to a temperature profile experienced by food 20, even though sensor 11 is not directly adjacent to food 20" (Paragraph (0036)). Therefore, Sharpe also does not disclose at least the feature of "a temperature sensor to detect a temperature of the food or a container containing the food," as is recited in claim 1 of the present application." The Examiner disagrees. The pan 20 is nothing but the cooking surface of food 20 or it the container containing the food 20 (see Para [0035] and as mentioned previously above. If the temperature sensor does not sense the temperature of the food 20, it invariably

senses the temperature of the food container 12 and thus reads the claims 1,16, 22 and 23. But in fact there are other temperature sensors 11a, one of which is clearly disposed close to the food/egg 20. These temperature sensors are connected to module 16. See Fig. 1 and Para [0036]. And it is also mentioned that food sensor is a known feature which was discussed during the last interview done on 03/31/06. The reference of US Patent 4,309,585 to Doi et al. , was discussed for the food sensor.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05/01/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argued, "It is also apparent from the drawings and specification of Sharpe that Sharpe does not disclose a temperature sensor which contacts the food or a container containing the food. Sharpe discloses an electronic cooking pan system 10 with temperature sensors 11/11a embedded inside a thermally conductive pan 12 to monitor the temperature of the pan 12 Fig. 1 and 2). The Examiner disagrees. The Applicant is requested to understand what the conductive pan 12 is. The pan 12 is nothing but the cooking pan. It is written in the abstract, "A digital cooking pan provides temperature and /or food doneness information associated with food cooked within the pan. A thermal sensor coupled with the pan senses temperature and generates corresponding signals, and processing electronics coupled with the sensor convert the signals to data to provide indications to a user of the cooking pan regarding food cooked within the pan." In specification Para [0035], line 3, "One or more temperature sensors 11 coupled with the pan 12". Now Fig. 1, abstract and the

specification it is apparent that the pan 12 is the cooking pan which cooks the food 20 and coupled with sensors 11/11a. Therefore, the rejections are proper.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-4806. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on (571) 272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4834

Art Unit: 3744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


MOHAMMAD M. ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER